

REMARKS

Applicants have cancelled several claims to limit the substantive review to amended claim 1 and its dependent claims. Applicants have amended claim 1 to substantially incorporate the limitations of dependent claims 4 and 5 regarding a mixing chamber defined between the nozzle and the end portions of the elongated body of the mixing apparatus.

In response to Applicants' previous amendments, a new grounds of rejection was levied in view of the PCT publication of Beller. Pertinent to this amendment, claims 1, 4 and 5 were said to be anticipated by Beller. It is believed that amended claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Beller.

The Examiner correctly identifies a single mixing chamber 30 in the elongated body 3 of Beller. As shown in FIG. 1, the tapered bores 36, 37 at the ends of the body 3 receive the tips 13, 23 of the syringes. The tips butt up against the nozzles 33, 35, as seen in FIG. 1. Thus, Beller does not disclose an enlarged mixing chamber between the nozzle and the portion at the opposite ends of the passageway that receives the syringe tip. Instead, Beller only discloses one chamber 30 that is between the two nozzles 33, 35 (see FIGS. 1, 2 and 5). Beller cannot anticipate amended claim 1 because it does not disclose every limitation in that claim.

Moreover, there is no suggestion in Beller to move the mixing chamber 30 to a location between the nozzles 33, 35 and the syringe tip receiving bores 36, 37. In each of the embodiments, Beller only discloses a single mixing chamber

that receives an element 4 that is fitted within that chamber. Beller further relies upon the interior element 4 to turn or disrupt the fluid flow through the body to accomplish the mixing function. On the other hand. Applicants' claimed invention does not require the interior element found in Beller because of the claimed combination of two mixing chambers flanking the nozzle.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is believed that this application, including claims 1, 2, 7-8 and 13-14 is in condition for allowance. Action toward that end is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would be helpful to address any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Michael D. Beck*

June 19, 2007

Michael D. Beck  
Reg. No. 32, 722  
Maginot, Moore & Beck, LLP  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
(317) 638-2922 (phone)  
(317) 638-2139 (fax)  
[mdbeck@maginot.com](mailto:mdbeck@maginot.com)